HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 40 Wednesday, October 7, 1959 Washington, D. C.

News Section

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

HERTER: *Agent for appeasement* (page 1)
ROCKEFELLER: *Out at home* (page 1)
STEELWORKERS: *Reuther's Trojan Horse* (page 2)
US ECONOMY: *Debunking the Reds* (page 3)
EDUCATION: *Conservative at Columbia* (page 3)

The Aftermath: Whatever else the consequences of the famous Khrushchev visit (and Capitol Hill thinks they will eventually prove deplorable), one outcome has greatly eased the tensions of the directors of Republican party policy. That is the decision to delay Ike's return visit to Moscow until late next spring.

The decision had nothing to do with "grandchildren," as Nikita Khrushchev suggested. It was based on the fear that a visit to the sub-zero Moscow climate in November would offer too many hazards to a President with a coronary history—as reported last week in HUMAN EVENTS. Already, the weight of responsibilities and overwork (plus a cold) have quite clearly—see the news-photos—worn down the Chief Executive and caused concern among his friends; hence the present vacation in the desert retreat near Palm Springs, California.

But the postponement of Ike's next huddle with Khrushchev until halfway through the 1960 campaign year has also removed much of the fear of GOP strategists that Khrushchev's visit here might boomerang against Ike and the GOP. As it stands now, the Democrats are boxed in. It's a case of "You can't shoot the piano player." Messers Lyndon Johnson and Sam Rayburn will be hardly likely to level guns at Ike until he sees Khrushchev again in Moscow—provided of course that the Administration does not start a policy of appeasement of Moscow, departing from the unyielding course set by the late Secretary Dulles.

However, behind that proviso some doubts loom in the Capital and already some guns are being unlimbered. The doubts are centered, not on Ike, but on Secretary of State Herter, the sick man who succeeded the dying Dulles. Not only is Herter considered a weak Secretary; he also has associations and influences which disturb conservatives who supported the course of Dulles. Principally, he is much too prone to listen to Senator Fulbright, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, an apostle of appeasement and follower of the "soft on communism" line of the British (Fulbright was a Rhodes Scholar).

HUMAN EVENTS can exclusively report that, just before the Camp David conference with Khrushchev, Herter outlined for recommendation to Ike a policy of appeasement of Moscow by recognizing the status quo in Eastern Europe, thereby validating Soviet control over the satellite states and sealing the Iron Curtain from American moral support to the captive peoples of those countries, suffering under the Russian yoke.

Already, word of this scheme has been leaking out. Senator Styles Bridges, from his office in Concord, New Hampshire, tells HUMAN EVENTS: "I am greatly disturbed by rumors around the State Department that such a plan has been broached. I am worried that such a plan would be even considered complacently by the directors of our foreign policy. It would be an abdication of our moral stand and principles."

What burns up Republicans on Capitol Hill is that this pattern for appeasement should be covertly nourished in the midst of the Administration just at a time when GOP conservatives and "liberals" have united on a directly opposite policy. For, on the last day of Khrushchev's visit as it happened, the *New York Times* (September 27) reported that the 44-man Percy Committee on Republican Policy had "tentatively decided to proclaim a policy of peaceful emancipation from Soviet rule for the Communist states of Eastern Europe."

In view of this Herter development, even the most sanguine Republican elements, which have recently felt victory ahead in 1960, are beginning to wonder. If the Herter appeasement policy (as above described) is gradually unfolded during the next six months, then Lyndon and Mr. Sam (not to mention many Republicans) can begin to "shoot at the piano player." For the GOP pros well realize that the votes of the kinsmen of these Eastern European peoples could go for the Democrats and could swing the election in the large population states. It is no wonder that Republicans on Capitol Hill, mindful of the appeasement record of Truman's Secretary of State, are beginning to refer to Herter as "Acheson without the mustache."

Nixon vs. Rockefeller: A survey of Republican party sentiment in New York State, conducted by TV-Radio Station WSYR of Syracuse, shows Nixon far in the lead of the New York Governor in the Nixon-Rockefeller race for GOP Presidential nomination.

The station canvassed the sentiment among Republican County Chairmen on two questions: (1) Which will win the GOP nomination, Nixon or Rockefeller? Responses (by percentages): 75 for Nixon; 25 for Rockefeller. (2) Which do you prefer? Responses: 67 for Nixon; 33 for Rockefeller. These results were released by the Syracuse station on September 30.

● Unnoticed in most of the press, but relayed in detail to Capitol Hill—Governor Nelson Rockefeller in his presumed plans to run for the GOP Presidential nomination has encountered significant opposition in his own backyard. On September 24, all nine newspapers

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Macy-owned Westchester County (N.Y.) chain ran an editorial which served as a counter-blast to a meeting of Rockefeller zealots demanding that their leader be drafted for the nomination. The editorial in the Macy newspapers, which last year enthusiastically supported Rockefeller for nomination and election for Governor, reminded him that the people of New York, when they elected him, expected he would remain on the job, and further remarked that he has not "really started" the job for which he was chosen; therefore he had better wait until he has made "a record of substantial achievement," before he seeks the Presidency.

● Senator Styles Bridges re-affirms that he is for Nixon for the GOP Presidential nomination and will be in the coming primary conflict. He says that the *New York Times* report on September 27, to the effect that he is "not entirely inflexible" on his preference for Nixon is "not right at all." It looks as if the *Times* reporter fell for a dose of pro-Rockefeller propaganda.

● Highly important reinforcement for Nixon—former GOP National Chairman Leonard Hall quietly arrived in Washington last week and is devoting full time to helping the Vice President's cause. Hailed as "the greatest Republican pro since Mark Hanna," Hall is expected to provide the Nixon-for-nominee movement with the political coordination and organizing know-how necessary to achieve victory at the convention.

Capitol Camera: During Khrushchev's visit to the US, the Soviets stopped jamming Voice of America broadcasts to Russia for the first time in ten years, and apparently they discovered something many Americans have contended all along, to wit: the subject matter generally selected for Voice broadcasts is harmless to communism. At least, since Khrushchev's return home, there are signs that the jamming may be discontinued permanently.

YOUR FRATERNITY OR SORORITY should get HUMAN EVENTS. Surveys indicate that each issue is read by from 10 to 25 students in each chapter; many lively debates follow. Send $7 for a college-year (8-month) subscription—for as many chapters as you can afford.

The Voice has been under frequent sharp attack in the US for trying to penetrate the Iron Curtain with tales of America's materialistic wealth—big new cars, television sets, kitchen appliances, etc. Many critics believe that the inhabitants of the Iron Curtain countries are bored with these same old "commercials." Say these critics: "What should be broadcast are stories of the evils of communism, the spiritual strength of America and the intangible advantages of life in a free society."

● Critics of our foreign aid program find an unexpected ally in Treasury Secretary Anderson, when they note his speech last week at the World Bank meeting in Washington. Anderson blamed the fact that—in our international balance of payments—we have been running a deficit partly because of dollar outflows of foreign aid. Anderson made a plea for European nations to take over (and off of our shoulders) some of this burden of foreign aid. Observers on Capitol Hill comment that there seems to be a strange conflict between the Treasury under Anderson which wants to lighten our load of foreign aid and the White House which insists on increasing it.

Strategy in Steel: When Walter Reuther placed a million-dollar credit for the use of David McDonald's United Steel Workers, the latter chieftain might well have been grateful—but with reservations. Such a fund, of course, would be helpful to the USW treasury at this critical time. Yet it is well known that Reuther and McDonald have not had friendly relations for many years. The latter might well fear the Greeks when they bear gifts, for reasons that involve his own future.

If McDonald wins a satisfactory settlement from the Steel companies, he remains in a strong position *vis-a-vis* USW elements long hostile to his rule as president of the union. But, if the rank and file should consider the wage increase they get little recompense for a long, costly strike (which most of them did not want anyway), then President McDonald would be in for trouble. It is recalled that two years ago Donald Rarick, a rival within the USW, piled up a big vote against McDonald, although the latter used union resources to defeat Rarick.

In such a conflict, Reuther might try to lever a new USW president into power, one who would be in Walter's corner in the union power situation. The $1 million credit would raise Reuther's prestige with the USW rank and file. It is believed that there are USW leaders who would be willing to play with Reuther to unseat McDonald.

The far-seeing head of the United Auto Workers may well envision a new president of the USW as subservient to him (Reuther) as is James B. Carey of the Electrical Workers. If Reuther once had the USW lined up with him, George Meany's hold on his position as president of the AFL-CIO would be substantially weakened—in short, Reuther is taking another step on his way to complete domination of the AFL-CIO.

The Budget: Claims by the leaders of the Democratic-controlled 86th Congress that they reduced the President's proposed 1960 Budget by some $1.8 billion are being assessed in Washington as so much hot air. In fact, Maurice H. Stans, President Eisenhower's director of the Budget, has informed the Chief Executive that "back-door financing" legislation and long-range spending programs adopted by the Congress this year will ultimately cost the taxpayers $12 billion more than is reflected in the "pared down" Budget.

Stans also points out that pending legislation passed by one or both Houses of Congress, now awaiting action at the next session, "would cost in future fiscal years an additional several billion dollars beyond the President's requests."

Despite the "hidden extras" contained in this year's congressional spending programs, most Washington observers agree that expenditures were held remarkably well in check in view of the attitude of the "liberals" who arrived in Washington last January with the claim that the 1958 election results had given them a mandate for bigger spending. On the other hand, few observers in the Nation's Capital will buy the Democrats' boast that they were responsible for the economizing that took place.

The Council of State Chambers of Commerce, which last week published a comprehensive report on Congress and the Budget, concludes that two things (neither of which was inspired by the Democrats) brought about

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moderation in the congressional spending drive: (1) the President's strong stand against Budget-busting schemes, including the use and threatened use of the veto; and (2) the grass roots support for the President's actions.

The Democratic-controlled Congress, the Council report emphasized, did practically nothing with a series of Budget recommendations which would have resulted in both immediate and long-range reductions in expenditures. These proposals include a more sound and less costly farm program, adequate user charges for Government services (including postal rate increases), revisions in grant and loan programs to bring about greater non-Federal participation in them and revision of costly veterans' pension laws.

On paper, the 1960 Budget is still precariously in balance, but a continuation of the steel strike or a slow recovery from it could put it in the red.

Bonds Bursting in Air: In view of the President's persistent week-by-week criticism of Congress for failing to lift the statutory interest limit on US bonds, a proposal to help alleviate the Government's problem is now going around Capitol Hill and commands some notice. Nine years ago, HUMAN EVENTS foreshadowed the present crisis in an article entitled "Bonds Bursting in Air" by Frank Chodorov. The general problem has been well outlined by President Eisenhower, but the immediate part of the problem—the necessity of floating about $7 billion in Government short-term securities, with great inflationary implications, before January 1, 1960—has made the above-mentioned proposal a matter of much discussion among Capitol Hill experts on the management of the Government debt.

For the suggestion is being made that $6.5 billion worth of longer term bonds could be floated if the Treasury would sell the securities at a sharp discount. Specifically, the idea is advanced that a consortium (composed of investment trusts, foundations and individual investors) would take $10 billion face value bonds, maturing in ten years, at the price of $6.5 billion, receiving no return until maturity (somewhat like E bonds). At the end of ten years, the Government would pay holders the principal and interest of $10 billion; the interest would be at the rate of approximately 4.20 per cent, within the statutory interest limit of 4.25.

The proponents of the suggested deal claim that the transaction would ease the inflationary pressures on the money market and might well bring back much American capital which has sought refuge abroad. In reply, some Treasury circles say that the worst of the money crisis has passed and by January the situation will prove to be much better—without any such deal.

Whatever the merits of the argument, Capitol Hill, conscious of the menace of inflation, finds a hopeful augury in the following fact: a large financial consortium discounts "galloping inflation" and shows confidence that its 1969 dollars will be worth approximately what its 1959 dollars are today.

US Economic Growth: Colin Clark, internationally respected economist, last week declared that the US economy is expanding faster than the Soviet Union's—and will continue to do so unless inflation stops growth.

Clark told the Congressional Joint Economic Committee that 20 per cent of Federal, state and local government expenditures should be eliminated immediately—particularly in fields such as agriculture, housing and education—and then taxes should be reduced until they take not more than one quarter of the national income. This course would remove the principal cause of inflation, Clark said, and the US would continue to maintain its widening economic lead over the Reds.

Clark is regarded even by "liberal" economists as a top expert in measuring economic growth. He testified that the US economy has grown at a 2.3 per cent rate annually since 1900 (as against the four or five per cent now deemed necessary by Nelson Rockefeller and Leon Keyserling)—while the Soviet Union has shown only 1.6 per cent annual growth since 1939. Kremlin claims of greater growth are based on the Reds' distorted statistics, which are, said Clark, "quoted by public officials and university professors who should know better." (For instance, Rockefeller and Keyserling.)

School Debates: High school debaters throughout the Nation will soon be trying their skill on this year's topic: "Resolved: That the Federal Government should substantially increase its regulation of labor unions."

Debate kits containing source materials have been prepared by the US Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO.

However, the labor organization has taken the further step of arranging for distribution of its kit through the National University Exension Associaion, the outfit which selects debate topics and arranges for national tournaments. Several thousand AFL-CIO kits have been sent out.

Meanwhile, the Chamber of Commerce kit has *not* been sent out; the kit goes only to individuals requesting it. Thus—as in the 1958 election—labor's side of this vital issue is presented to the public, while management fails to obtain equal time for its side, at least so far.

It should also be noted that the Chamber of Commerce magazine on education, *News & Cues*, recommends a special *Congressional Digest* issue prepared for high school debaters and containing material for both sides of the debate—a service annually performed by the *Digest*. The Committee on Political Education of the AFL-CIO, on the other hand, makes no mention of this non-partisan source of information in its "Political Memo," but merely recommends its own material—hardly a basis for an unbiased study of the issue.

Parents of high school debaters should make sure their youngsters know both sides of this important question by writing to the US Chamber at 1615 H St., NW, Washington 6, D.C., asking for the "Labor Reform Debate Kit," or by writing to *Congressional Digest*, 1631 K St., NW, Washington, for its August-September issue.

Education: There is a new look at Columbia University Teachers College, long a spawning ground for "progressive" education theories and "life adjustment" courses for public schools. Dr. John R. Fisher, newly appointed dean of the Teachers College, takes exception to the "frills and fads" which have crept into the Nation's schools in recent years. Furthermore, he does not believe

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that children should be allowed to write their own educational ticket, thus following the line of least resistance in selecting courses of study.

Speaking before the New Jersey School Superintendents Association, Dr. Fisher decried the lack of importance attached to the teaching of English. "It is unfortunate that in the flurry of our current excitement about science, mathematics and foreign languages," he said, "we have not continued to emphasize that the effectiveness of education in every other field comes to rest ultimately upon the student's ability to use his mother tongue."

Dr. Fisher warned against the use of school facilities and resources for purposes other than education when they interfere with the teaching program. "The school which is expected to mount activities to entertain its adult community at the expense of time and resources that should be devoted to teaching science or history cannot hope to develop the intellectual competence of its pupils as it otherwise might."

● Significant in the growing dissatisfaction with our public school programs is a preliminary report from the Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents, which has concluded a three-year, $90,000 study of public education sentiment in that state. Among other findings was a strong parental expression that schools should not be overburdened with functions that should be the responsibilities of the home, the church and other agencies. Parents cited driver-training in particular as a program that should not be conducted on school time.

According to the survey, most Connecticut residents want the curriculum to concentrate on English, mathematics, science, history and foreign languages. Other approved subjects, they feel, should be treated as secondary functions.

American Eye Opener: Tossing cold water on the coexisters who have filled the press and airwaves in recent weeks with folksy tidbits about Russia and the Khrushchevs, the House Committee on Un-American Activities last week released two booklets geared to awaken the most wishful thinkers.

The Committee released testimony entitled "The Crimes of Khrushchev," given on September 4, by Eugene Lyons, author, senior editor of *Reader's Digest,* and a man known for his deep penetrating analysis of communism.

Regarding the Khrushchev visit, Lyons said: "It amounts to an acknowledgement by the world's leading democracy of the Kremlin's power and permanence. Therefore it adds prestige to every Communist group in every country . . . That invitation will be taken by Communists, their fellow-travelers, their victims, as a symbol of our weakness . . .

"For years Khrushchev has maneuvered for such an invitation . . . While we kid ourselves about 'thaws' and 'relaxed tensions,' Communists everywhere are intensifying their activities."

In another booklet titled, "The Communist Parcel Operation," the Committee unmasked what Chairman Francis Walter (D.-Pa.) called "the inhumanity and cruelty of the enemy we face."

It reveals how Red blackmail is practiced at the expense of generous free worlders and suffering peoples behind the Iron Curtain. Gifts of food and clothing sent to persons in Russia and the satellite countries must clear through the Soviet agency Intourist. The Reds take a huge cut in the form of import duties, customs inspection fees and Intourist commissions.

Total cost to Americans sending parcels to residents of Russia alone, according to the Committee's most conservative estimate, approximates $70 million. This payoff is of course in American currency, much sought after by the Commies.

Teen-Age Violence: FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover labels the growing youthful crime wave "a monster of frightening proportions," and calls for a stern and "all-out counterattack against vicious young thugs."

Pointing a finger at the guardians of delinquent youngsters, Hoover says that parents who inflict vicious offspring on their fellow men "deserve to feel the sting of public indignation and to face legal and financial responsibility for the criminal acts of their children."

Hoover also says: ". . . any escape from justice by youthful lawbreakers—through weak court systems, public indifference, soft-headed sentimentality, senseless preference for the rights of the criminal instead of for his victim—can only give encouragement to other young thugs."

REV. RICHARD M. SNAVELY, Director, Area for Youth, Naples, N.Y.: "Recently a friend introduced me to HUMAN EVENTS and immediately I was thrilled to know of such a publication that published truth. Keep up the good work. It is certainly appreciated and greatly needed."

VICE ADMIRAL JOHN F. SHAFROTH, U.S.N. (Ret.): "I am glad to tell you that I consider HUMAN EVENTS a fearless, frank and honest publication that is pro-America and anti-Communist. It keeps its readers in close touch with the political situation in Washington."

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, management and circulation, required by the Act of Congress of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Acts of March 3, 1933 and July 2, 1946. Published weekly at Washington, D.C., for October 1, 1959. 1. The names and addresses of the editor, publisher, executive publisher and business manager are: Editor, Frank C. Hanighen, 4745 Reservoir Road, N.W., Washington, D.C.; Publisher, Frank C. Hanighen, 4745 Reservoir Road, N.W., Washington, D.C.; Executive Publisher, James L. Wick, 135 D St., S.E., Washington, D.C.; Business Manager, W. B. Hicks, Jr., 640 Girard St., N.E. 2. The owner is: OWNER—HUMAN EVENTS, INC., 408 First St., S.E., Washington 3, D.C. Stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock: Frank C. Hanighen, 4745 Reservoir Road, N.W., Washington, D.C.; James L. Wick, 135 D St., S.E., Washington, D.C. 3. The known bondholders, mortgagees and other security holders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: NONE. 4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner. 5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was: 39,220. W. B. HICKS, JR., Business Manager. Sworn to and subscribed before me this 15th day of September, 1959. Kathryn A. Zagami, *Notary Public, District of Columbia. Commission expires April 30, 1962.*

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, GEORGE O. FOWLER

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Since the Rockefeller managers—despite denials—will base the New York Governor's drive for the GOP nomination upon public opinion polls, the following authoritative analysis will without doubt be one of the most-quoted documents of the 1960 Presidential campaign. This article is a compilation of the facts regarding public opinion polls presented in a brilliant new book, *Out of the Jaws of Victory,* a study of the 1948 Presidential election, by Jules Abels. The book published by Henry Holt & Co., priced at $4.95, can be ordered from HUMAN EVENTS.

Vol. XVI, No. 40 HUMAN EVENTS October 7, 1959
Article Section

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

The Dubious Record of the Public Opinion Polls

By JULES ABELS

UNTIL THE 1948 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION, public opinion polls had been considered well-nigh infallible. But in that year, the boners of George Gallup whose polling organizations are an international institution operating in many countries created a world wide sensation. In Paris, *Le Figaro,* paraphrasing Henry IV, headlined, "BRAVE GALLUP, GO HANG YOURSELF!"

The techniques of well-established polls, like Gallup, on the basis of their record and the limited knowledge of them which is public property, are not such as to inspire confidence.

Let's start with the 1948 race, the only close Presidential election since the invention of the polls and the best test of their reliability.

On January 21, 1948 the Gallup Poll showed Truman with 46 per cent, Dewey 41 per cent, Wallace 6 per cent and the remainder undecided. In April, the Gallup Poll showed Truman behind Dewey and Stassen. Only 36 per cent of the people approved Truman as President compared with 55 per cent a few months before.

There was a similar flip-flop in the case of the Republican nomination. On March 28 Gallup showed 34 per cent of Republicans for Dewey to 15 per cent for Stassen. Then Stassen scored great victories in Wisconsin and Nebraska. Less than a month after the March 28 poll, Gallup came out with a new poll which registered an amazing advance for Stassen to put him in the lead over Dewey. But Dewey, not Stassen, won the nomination.

After Dewey's nomination, his campaign strategy was considerably influenced by the polls which indicated that there was no need to speak out on the issues. Dewey was a great believer in polls. The first Presidential candidate to be born in this century, he prided himself on being "a child of the Twentieth Century." When he ran for the Republican nomination in 1940, he had his private pollsters who tested every stand he took.

IN THE SUMMER OF 1948 the three big national polls, the Gallup Poll, the Crossley Poll and the Roper Poll, showed Dewey far ahead. Elmo Roper announced in July that he had stopped polling, that it was silly to continue to take polls since the result was foregone and he could spend his time profitably otherwise. "I can think of nothing duller or more intellectually barren than acting like a sports announcer who feels that he must pretend that he is witnessing a neck-and-neck race that will end in a photo-finish or a dramatic upset of the favorite and then finally have to announce that the horse which is eight lengths ahead at the turn is still eight lengths ahead at the end."

Harold Stassen told me that he visited Dewey at his farm at Pawling in July after his nomination

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and warned him that he faced a formidable foe in Truman. Dewey, smiling, pulled out an advance copy of Roper's announcement and said, "My job is to prevent anything from rocking the boat."

Truman during the campaign was exasperated with the polls which showed him inching up but still far behind Dewey. At Cleveland, he called them "sleeping polls . . . but most of the people are not being fooled. They know sleeping polls are bad for the system, they affect the mind. An overdose could be fatal." Twirling an imaginary mustache, he said that the same doctor he had previously discussed (who had been passing out a soothing syrup called "unity") was passing out these polls.

ON THE EVE OF THE ELECTION all polls agreed. Roper had stopped polling months before when Dewey had 52.2 per cent of the vote, Truman 37.1 per cent. On election eve Roper said, "I stand by my prediction. Dewey is in." The Crossley Poll had 49.9 per cent for Dewey and 44.8 per cent for Truman with 1.6 per cent for Thurmond and 3.3 per cent for Wallace.

The Gallup Poll had 49.5 per cent for Dewey, 44.5 per cent for Truman and 2 per cent for Thurmond and 4 per cent for Wallace. Democratic Chairman McGrath attacked the Gallup Poll results, saying that it had previously erred in favor of the Republicans. Adjusting state by state by this margin of error and eliminating the undecided he said there was practically a tie. As for the undecided McGrath said they would go mostly for Truman. Gallup replied, "Either he is wrong or we are. We will know in a week." McGrath's statements, he added, were "part of politics."

On election night came the great shock. Dr. Gallup on the ABC television network showed a beaming face only in the beginning of the evening. At 2:50 a.m. he said that it was probable that Truman had gotten an electoral vote majority and a reporter commented that Gallup looked "like an animal eating its young."

It appeared that pollsters had been discredited for good. Newspapers like the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* canceled the Gallup Poll. The Indiana State Senate rose for a minute in silent tribute "to the memory of George Gallup." Wilfred Funk of the *Literary Digest,* which was put out of business after it predicted Landon as the winner in the 1936 election, said, "I do not want to seem malicious, but I can't help but get a good chuckle out of this." Gallup's first reaction was "which voters stayed home?" He later put the blame on the last-minute shift of voters and said that the error was in taking the last reading ten days before the result and assuming that the undecided would not vote. Roper said, "I could not have been more wrong and the thing that bothers me at the moment is that I don't know why I was wrong."

Later Roper said that there had been too much reliance on direct questions and too little on attitude scales. Crossley blamed the polls for ruining the polls, "I am convinced that the widespread publicity given the polls findings served to redouble Democratic efforts to bring out the vote and may have created overconfidence among Republicans." Explanations in any case seemed to be inadequate. As the Chicago *Daily News* said, "The pollsters may say that the error was not great but when a man breaks into a dance after he has been pronounced dead the doctor can reasonably expect to lose a few patients."

For no apparent reason, soon after the 1948 debacle, the polls rose phoenix-like out of their ashes. Since it is the most popular one, let us look at the Gallup Poll. Dewey told me he believes in the accuracy of the Gallup Poll, but Gallup stopped polling two weeks too soon. Gallup advises me that "the failure to poll up to the very end of the campaign was the greatest mistake" made in 1948. But Gallup in "A Guide to Public Opinion Polls," published before the election, said that it was "unthinkable" that polls could make an error like the *Literary Digest* error because for one reason, "polling organizations are aware of the time factor and for this reason usually insist upon polling almost to the day of the election."

ONE PERSON did question the polls in 1948. Robert Cobb Myers of the Psychology Department of Princeton in *Commentary* magazine raised doubts.[1] His article written before the election appeared in the November issue. He pointed to a strange case. In March 1948, Gallup announced the results of a poll on the question, "Do you think that prices will be higher, lower or about the same

[1] "Opinion Polls and Public Policy," *Commentary,* November 1948

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in six months?" The results—higher, 14 per cent; lower, 39 per cent; same, 36 per cent. Roper published a poll in April in *Fortune,* asking the question with the one inconsequential change, "Do you think the prices of things you buy will be higher, lower, or about the same?" The results—higher, 54 per cent; lower, 9 per cent; same, 22 per cent.

Myers also referred to Gallup's consistent underestimate of the Democratic vote and a serious admission that Gallup made before the House Committee on Campaign Expenditures in December 1944. *Myers was referring to the fact that Gallup had altered his own figures. He had arbitrarily subtracted two percentage points from the Roosevelt vote in his August, September, and October* 15, 1944 *polls because he guessed there would be a low turnout which would reduce the Democratic vote.*[2] *But he did not inform his readers about what he had done; for this lack of disclosure, he was criticized by a Technical Committee of eminent statisticians, including Louis Bean and Morris Hansen. His estimate of the* 1944 *New York vote was based on what the committee called "nonpolling evidence," meaning his own judgment.*

An interesting feature of Gallup's subtraction from Roosevelt's vote in 1944 is the premise as stated by Gallup in a release of October 5, 1948, "A small vote turnout hurts the Democrats more that the GOP because a large percentage of the stay-at-homes are Democrats." Truman won in 1948 on an extraordinarily low turnout and Eisenhower won in 1952 on an extraordinarily high turnout, so that premise was proven to be incorrect.

After election, Gallup sometimes issues a statement intended to show how small his margin of error was. His method of computing errors is one which professional statisticians do not accept. He subtracts the forecast percentage from the actual percentage vote which minimizes the error. Thus he predicted 51 per cent for Eisenhower in 1952. Since Eisenhower got 55.4 per cent of the vote, Gallup calls this a 4.4 error. It is actually an 8.6 per cent error (4.4 divided by 51).

A 40 per cent error on the Wallace vote in 1948 is turned into an error of 1.6 per cent by subtracting the actual 2.4 per cent from the predicted 4 per cent. Since a national party traditionally polls a minimum of 40 per cent of the vote, Gallup can never be wrong by more than 20 per cent —everyone else in the world can be wrong by 100 per cent.

Gallup's errors have been on the majestic side. In 1944 he underestimated the Democratic vote in each of 40 states. He underestimated Roosevelt's total by one-third, 140 electoral votes. In 1948 he had Dewey the winner of 170 electoral votes which he lost, an error of almost a third of the total electoral vote. While an error of two per cent is critical in a toss-up state, he underestimated Truman's vote by 18 per cent in Massachusetts and 24 per cent in Minnesota, both considered toss-up states that year.

In the runaway 1952 race, his last release said that Eisenhower and Stevenson were "coming down the homestretch in a tight race" and he could not predict the result.

The basic problem with polls is the sample, which must be an accurate cross-section of the voting population. In 1948 Gallup used 61,674 interviews over a period of two months.[3] In Massachusetts in 1948 the interviews used only 968 persons out of a vote of 2,155,346.

Gallup listed religion among the more than nine factors used as controls in quota sampling. But in 1948, the decisive factor in Massachusetts was the Catholic vote. Certainly the 968 ballots from which he drew his conclusions could not have given proper weight to the fact that a birth control referendum brought more Catholics than non-Catholics out to vote. The case of Massachusetts in 1948 illustrates that to draw an accurate sample the pollster must make his own value judgment as to what the impact of the various issues will be. That is opinion, not science.

Then consider the problem of interviewing to the last minute, which practically must mean up to the last five days. The 61,674 interviews of 1948, which we have mentioned, had to be spread over a two-months period, since Gallup has several poll reports. Let us assume that as many as one-fourth of the interviews could be crammed into the final poll. (Gallup used the whole sample for his

[2] See *The Pollsters* by Lindsay Rogers, p. 130, Gallup thought that Roosevelt's percentage of 53 per cent in the October 15 poll was too high and he reduced it by two points. When the Democratic percentage declined to 51 per cent in the October 27 and November 6 polls, he published the actual figure without any subtractions.

[3] The figures in the 1948 election are drawn from "The Pre-Election Polls of 1948" by Frederick Mosteller and others of the Social Science Research Council, published by that organization.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

final prediction unless the last wave of ballots showed a new trend.) That means only 15,418 interviews over the Nation to ascertain the final result. Dividing the actual number of interviews in 1948 by one-fourth, we would have 242 in Massachusetts, 454 in California, 266 in Iowa, and 280 in Minnesota. Gallup dislikes talking about the number interviewed, but can any sound conclusions be drawn from these tiny numbers in a vast voting population? And yet, Dr. Gallup wrote me that he used samples in 1948 larger "than we needed to or than we would do now."

It appears from the Social Science Research Council study that Gallup's national forecast was not a composite of his state forecasts but was the result of a national sample of 3,250 persons. We do know that the sample Gallup uses for polls such as Presidential popularity polls is around 3,000. The common-sense question is—Can one imagine a Congressman making up his mind by canvassing seven persons in his district, since that is the equivalent of 3,250 nationwide?

IT IS A LARGE VOTE, not that of a handful which blends all the shadings of opinion. As Professor Henry Steele Commager says,[4] while groups "*tend* to vote in one way rather than another, the groupings are overlapping, blurred and unreliable." Any careful study "would quickly disclose that politically there was no such thing as the 'farmer' but that there were instead Connecticut Valley tobacco farmers and Maine potato farmers and Georgia cotton farmers and Minnesota wheat farmers and Long Island truck farmers and California fruit farmers . . . in so large and diversified a Nation as ours most of these special interests cancel out."

The sample technique requires that the pollster or his interviewers choose the voter who is the common denominator, a process which can be a subject of endless argument. He has not solved the problem as to what to do with the undecided vote. He does not know who will turn out to vote. Then there is the problem of interviewing at the lowest economic and cultural level, of which Gallup has said, "When you get down to the foreign-born and so on you have one devil of a problem interviewing."

[4] "Is it the Man or is it the Issue," *New York Times Magazine*, October 12, 1952.

Here is a humorous footnote to show how the answers given in interviews are notoriously unreliable. The housewives in Los Angeles were recently polled on "Do you think the Mann Act deters or helps the cause of organized labor?" Only 12 per cent knew what the Mann Act was, yet 48 per cent took a position: 38 per cent for repeal, 10 per cent against repeal. One reason cited against repeal was, "Hoffa gets away with too much as it is." (The Mann Act forbids women to be taken across state lines for immoral purposes.)

Since 1948 pollsters have used new jargon. They talk of "intensity surveys" to disclose who will vote. But a vote based on whim or caprice, such as the aversion to Dewey's mustache in 1948, may be as solid as one based on research and contemplation. They also talk of "interviews in depth"; but for an election if a person says he favors Kennedy over Rockefeller, how much "deeper" can one go without wasting one's time?

The ditty sung by a character representing Dr. Gallup in a parody at the Gridiron Dinner in 1948 still holds true,

> Ah, sweet mystery of life, we have not found thee,
>
> Ah, we do not know the secret of it all.

So much for the well-established polls. As for *private* polls, which prospective Presidential candidates may underwrite—well, one can safely say that their results will not disappoint those who pay for them.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me ..... reprints of "THE DUBIOUS RECORD OF THE PUBLIC OPINION POLLS" at $.....

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles, add 1c per copy; for airmail, add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED